

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
Southern Division**

O'REILLY AUTOMOTIVE STORES, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

BEARING TECHNOLOGIES, LTD.,

Defendant.

:

:

:

:

:

Case No. 6:16-cv-03102-REL

[JURY TRIAL DEMANDED]

**MOTION TO DISMISS COUNTERCLAIMS**

Plaintiff, O'Reilly Automotive Stores, Inc. ("O'Reilly"), moves the Court to dismiss all Counterclaims asserted by Defendant, Bearing Technologies, Ltd. ("BT") in its Answer and Counterclaims, dated July 11, 2016 (ECF No. 16) for failure to state a claim on which relief can be granted. In support of its Motion, O'Reilly hereby incorporates its contemporaneously filed Suggestions In Support of Motion to Dismiss Counterclaims (ECF No. 23) and states:

1. Count 1 of the Counterclaims purports to assert a claim for "Federal Trademark Infringement" under Section 32 of the Lanham Act. (ECF No. 16 at p. 21.) It should be dismissed because: (i) BT does not allege that it owns a federally registered mark; (ii) it is barred by the doctrine of acquiescence as a matter of law; and (iii) it is barred by the doctrine of laches as a matter of law.

2. Count II of the Counterclaims purports to assert a claim for "False Designation of Origin" under Section 43(a)(1)(B) of the Lanham Act. (ECF No. 16 at p. 22.) It should be dismissed because: (i) it is barred by the doctrine of acquiescence as a matter of law; and (ii) it is barred by the doctrine of laches as a matter of law.

3. Count III of the Counterclaims purports to assert a claim for “Unfair Competition” under Section 43(a)(1)(A) of the Lanham Act. (ECF No. 16 at p. 22.) It should be dismissed because: (i) it is barred by the doctrine of acquiescence as a matter of law; (ii) it is barred by the doctrine of laches as a matter of law; and (iii) it is duplicative of Count II of the Counterclaims.

4. Count IV of the Counterclaims purports to assert a claim for “Trademark Infringement Under Missouri Law” pursuant to Mo. Rev. Stat. § 417.056. (ECF No. 16 at pp. 23-24.) It should be dismissed because: (i) BT does not allege that it owns a registered mark in Missouri; (ii) it is barred by the doctrine of acquiescence as a matter of law; and (iii) it is barred by the doctrine of laches as a matter of law.

5. Count V of the Counterclaims purports to assert a claim for “Trademark Infringement Under Ohio Law” pursuant to Ohio Revised Code § 1329.65 and Ohio common law. (ECF No. 16 at pp. 24-25.) It should be dismissed because: (i) BT does not allege that it owns a registered mark in Ohio; (ii) it is barred by the doctrine of acquiescence as a matter of law; and (iii) it is barred by the doctrine of laches as a matter of law.

6. Count VI of the Counterclaims purports to assert a claim for “Unfair Competition Under Missouri Law.” (ECF No. 16 at pp. 25-26.) It should be dismissed because: (i) it is barred by the doctrine of acquiescence as a matter of law; and (ii) it is barred by the doctrine of laches as a matter of law.

7. Count VII of the Counterclaims purports to assert a claim for “Unfair Competition Under Ohio Law.” (ECF No. 16 at p. 26.) It should be dismissed because: (i) it is barred by the doctrine of acquiescence as a matter of law; and (ii) it is barred by the doctrine of laches as a matter of law.

8. Count VIII of the Counterclaims purports to assert a claim for “False or Fraudulent Registration” in procuring trademark registrations from the United States Patent and Trademark Office. (ECF No. 16 at pp. 27-28.) It should be dismissed because it fails to satisfy the plausibility standard of Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Supreme Court’s decisions in *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009) and *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, O’Reilly Automotive Stores, Inc. respectfully requests the Court enter its Order dismissing the Counterclaims asserted by Defendant, Bearing Technologies, Ltd. for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted and granting O’Reilly such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

*Respectfully submitted,*

Kenneth A. Plevan (Pro Hac Vice)  
kenneth.plevan@skadden.com  
David M. Lamb (Pro Hac Vice)  
david.lamb@skadden.com  
**SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE,  
MEAGHER & FLOM LLP**  
Four Times Square  
New York, New York 10036  
Telephone: (212) 735-3000  
Facsimile: (212) 735-2000

/s/ Jason C. Smith  
Jason C. Smith (Mo. Bar No. 57657)  
**SPENCER FANE LLP**  
2144 East Republic Road, Ste. B300  
Springfield, Missouri 65804  
Telephone: (417) 888-1013  
Facsimile: (417) 881-8035  
jcsmith@spencerfane.com  
***Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterclaim  
Defendant O’Reilly Automotive Stores, Inc.***

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that on this 19th day of August, 2016, a true and accurate copy of the foregoing instrument was filed with the Court's electronic filing system, which sent notice of such filing to:

Jesse L. Jenike-Godshalk  
Thompson Hine – Cincinnati  
Email: [jesse.jenike-godshalk@thompsonhine.com](mailto:jesse.jenike-godshalk@thompsonhine.com)

Laurence Robert Tucker  
Armstrong Teasdale LLP-KCMO  
Email: [lrtucker@armstrongteasdale.com](mailto:lrtucker@armstrongteasdale.com)

Thomas Francis Zych  
Thompson Hine – Cleveland  
Email: [tom.zych@thompsonhine.com](mailto:tom.zych@thompsonhine.com)

/s/ Jason C. Smith